1887-88
(L.R.)

File No. 36-87
Serial No. 1-27

(P.110):

Sub:- Appeal of Bhaskaraiah Nanjundappa and others Regarding the Shanbhogue of Nalavagal and Kodihally Villages in the Mandya Taluk

...ees.

(Land ...

...ERAL AND REVENUE SEC...

...al Nos. 1 – 29

Part B for November

SUBJECT.

...hunkaraiya Ranjudu ...
...ers re the Shankh...
...Richard Williams ...
...Talukh...

Terminated

L.R. 36-87

Memorandum.

References —

Dist. Cure Deputy's
Cons. No: 7 of
the 5th Feby 1884.

In February 1884
a Petition was received
by the Sub Division
Officer of Trincomalee
Rocks from the
Ryots of Kodikalli
in the Mandya
(then Muddúr Sub
Taluk), stating that
Bhaskaraiah who
was performing the
duties of Shanboge
of their village, [redacted]
was a man of doubtful
character; [redacted] that
as he had misappropriated
some Govt. money
during the Military
of Lieut. Narasimhayya
the latter officer ordered
that the duties must
be performed by
the registered
Shanboge Narayya
that the latter accordingly
performed the duties
himself; [redacted] that
as the present Deputy
Collector is not aware

of the antecedents
of Zekariah,
the latter has
again begun to
perform the duties;
and that, as he is
in the habit of making
collections excessively
from the Ryots with
a view of misappropriating
the excess, it is very
necessary that he
should be forbidden
from interfering
with the duties. This
Petition was sent
to the Munsiff
Deputy Amildar
for enquiry and
Report. The registered
Shanbogue Narappa
deposed that the
Shanboguee duties
of Kodikalli and
Kilarugeri used
to be originally performed
by his paternal uncle
Dyaveiah; that after
his

his death, Rhadkarial,
a distant cousin of the
deceased, performed
the duties for one year,
when Sr. Ramasinghe,
the then Builder, ordered
that Rhadkarial must
not do the work, but
that the Registered
Shanbogue (deponent)
himself should perform
all the duties; that
accordingly he (deponent)
did the work in the
years Pramadi, Vikrama
and Vrisha; that in the
year Chitrabhanu the
said Rhadkarial
having represented
that he had no means
of livelihood, he
(deponent) permitted
him to officiate
for him; that there
was no official
authority for
Rhadkarial to
officiate, and that
therefore he (deponent)
would henceforth
perform his own
duties.

On questioning
those whose signatures
had

had referred to the above petition, they denied all knowledge of the petition.

Mr Kaskariah deposed that, as Nazaretha and himself were the equal shareholders to the office, he was officiating for 13 years with Nazaretha's consent; and that he was ready to act up to any orders which might be now issued in the matter.

Thereupon, the Deputy Builder of Nazaretha, on the 13th April 1884, passed an order to the following effect:—

"Though no charges have been proved against Mr Kaskariah the trustee having denied all knowledge of the petition, still it is not proper that

R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1887-88

~~192~~

(Land Rev)

File

Ser

er references.

ENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETAR

Serial Nos. 1—28

Part B for 1 Item 2 e

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Bhau Karaiji Rau
ramukh & others re. the S
Vetivagal & Kodikkal, Ni
in Nandya Taluk—

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—11-6-20

2

that he should do the work while he is not the Registered Associator, simply on a private arrangement. Therefore I have ordered that the duties must be performed by the Registered Shoeburyness Harwich Pilot. A Report will be made to the Sub Division Officer accordingly."

In reply the Sub Division Officer on the 23rd January 1884, ordered the Deputy Builder to produce the contending Parties during the January.

The Deputy Builder did so on the 2nd March 1885. But the Sub Division Officer on the 8th June 1885, ordered the Parties to be produced

Jesudasen Veerasamy
accountant proceedings
as he was not
able to settle the
matter in the
Customs yard.

The Deputy Collector
proceeded there
before the Circle
Division Officer
on the 16th February
1886, when the Circle
Division Officer
issued an order
No: 439 dated the
24th February 1886,
to the following
effect:—

"In an order
No: 498 issued by
the then Collector on
the 30th December 1879,
it is stated that as
Kumaraha is the
"Karawandoh", he
himself should do
the collection work
You have reported in

7

in June last of the 20th April 1884 that Rebaskoriah has deposed that he has been performing the duties for nearly 13 years with the consent of Committee, and that Committee has stated that he will henceforth do the duties himself. Baskoriah, also appeared before me, stated that he has been officiating for a long time, as he was the Assessor of the 2 villages in question, but he produced no record in support of his statement. Under any circumstances it is now impossible to split the charge. It is to be considered after the survey whether Baskoriah is entitled to any share. He can formally institute a claim for it. At present the Karnavar Government [redacted] perform the duties."

Against the above order Baskoriah appeals

Appeals to this Office,
on the following
Chief Grounds:—

(1) That the Appellant's
Petition was a Petition
to the Karowanoe Mura Upa,
and by virtue of
such title the Appellant
was enjoying the Office
of the two villages Kodebalii
and Malawagall.

(2) That no similar
Counterclaim was
ever Lambogué's
Charge.

(3) That he was
prepared to produce
evidence in support
of his title; but the
Sub Dist. Officer passed
the above order
without giving
him time.

(4) That the authenticated
Copies of Register Baranta
produced, will show
that his Petition was
the Petition to the
above two villages.

The Register for
the year 1894 shows that
Dyanish was a Petitioner
for the villages registered in

* Petition No. 2895
of December 1894.

* Dyanish or Dyanesh

9

the name of Caracalla.
But it is found
that there are some
interlineations and
corrections made in
it

Macrinus admits
that Dyaenis was
a Paredar, and as
such he was performing
the duties of Hadrianalli
and Silavagell during
his lifetime; but denies
that Diadumenian
is Dyaenis's ~~[illegible]~~
natural or adopted
son; and states that
he is a very distant
cousin of his, and
therefore not entitled
to the Piece he claims
as Succession Real Estate, but is by
the Paredar
A List of Inventories
filed with the Record,
shows that several
persons who are
only Paredeans, &
who have not
been Registered as
Paredans, are
now the Officiators
of Towns & Villages
in this
Province of Caracalla.

10

Memorandum

19/5/88

Lodge

Ent

Memorandum agreed upon & signed by delegates

Memorandum will

be forwarded to Sec.

[illegible]

25/5

Endorsed
26/5/88.

Genealogical tree. Produced by PM.



Note.

D - means dead.

The names of the parties are underlined by blue & red pencil lines.

V.
p. 4 -

Note - The 3rd Dept Puttaiyan bin Puttaiyan - is stated to be a relation of his M. the 3rd Dept's name does not appear in his list given above. He also is said before his Sub Division Officer.

The shanbhog's list of 1817 contains the following particulars -

1. Name of shanbhog — Nanjappa.
2. No of person now doing duty actually — 3 villages & the above person - His father Nyaravira 3 villages - Nanjappa 2 villages - altogether 8 villages. Mallesaiyan, shanbhog says, is a Hissedar for all the 8 villages.
3. Names of villages — Nanjappa { 1. Hosteru 2. Marshijanhalli 3. Mudi &c.

Nyaravira { 1. Talgatta or Kil patta. 2 Koorhalli 3. Nilavagalu

Nanjappa - { 1 Kontanhalli 2 ~~Mudige~~ Mudhalli

The Register of shanbhogs for the year 1862 shows the particulars noted below —

No - 27.
Name of Barawardar — Hosteru Puttaiya
Names of villages — Hosteru, Marshijanhalli 2 Kontanhalli - Nilvagalu 4 Mudhalli 5 Mudgere Koorhalli 6 Talgatta 7 & 8.
Remark — "The Barawardar for the above 8 villages are Puttaiya & Nanjappa — Puttaiya enjoys Talgatta & the remaining half is enjoyed as noted below."

next sheet —

No authenticated Extract prior thereto for 1864.

We desire that the original Registers should be produced

Order No 364 of 10th August 1864 — Section II — Copy of an Order

The officer —

[illegible] Upper (this) Region on the subject of the arrangements [illegible] Kamptee & Nagpore & Seetabuldee & Kamptee & Nagpore & Seetabuldee & Kamptee & Nagpore & Seetabuldee &

No — 28.
Name of Barawardan — Suvappa.
In personal enjoyment — Suvappa - 3 villages - half a share.
In others' enjoyment — Desappa 2 villages
Iyanayja 3 villages

Name of person now doing duty actually — Horiya, Muttiya, Mara Nisan Lalla. } Suvappa - Order No 142 of 1861 received from the Division Mudaliyar that until he (Suvappa) becomes fit for work he should be taken from his man Bharakaraya.

Kiligatta, Nilavagalu, Kodi Lalla. } Iyavappa

Kontan Lalla, Mul Lalla } Desappa - does work because he is a Vissedar -

The original registers of 1847, 1862, & 1864 have not been received.
The above particulars are mentioned in the 'Authenticated Extracts produced.

b. have the records arranged into -

(1) A file - containing plaint, appeal petn, deositions and other material papers - with a list of exhibits arranged & filed at the end of the A file -

2 B file - Containing - vakalats, Process issued, Remands applications for Copy & such other unimportant papers.

N
21/1/92



of Narnappa - Ananthaiah younger brother - should be registered in lieu of Narappa (dead). with effect from the 15th inst. Mark should be taken from Hyderabad until Narnappa became fit.

4h IV. Endorsement given from the Revenue Office - to Narnappa - Barward Shanbhag of Nilavagal & Kodihalli - No. 360 of 21st July 1888.

"With reference to your letter of 13 May it has been decided that the Barwardar himself should conduct the Shanbhogi duties & ~~Order~~ letter no. 501 of 30 May sent to the Dy Com. Mysore...

× Refs put up

21

/ The original Khoja of the Dy Com - in Fs: no 1 of 1890-91 have not been received.

2 The Shanbhogi Papers - in original - up to date - have not been sent up.

3. The records have been sent up with a general Index - It would be convenient if the lower Courts Copy of the Amildar Cutcherry could be made

11/6

B

Appeal No 27 of 1891

Appl
Nanjunda
adopted son of
Deva.—

Resp
Ramappa.—

Appl brought a suit for the recovery of the Karnam office of Shanbhogi in the villages of Nelavagal & Kodahalli (Chas Kanive)
These villages were held by the natural brother of the appellant up to 1886 when the Sub Dr Offr issued an order that as regd was the Karnam only he should do duties, & that of Ishanamah was entitled to the office he neglecting a deputy. The order was confirmed by the Dewan. —

The Resp admits that the appellant is adopted father was his grandfather's brother's son, but denies the adoption of the appellant, & further states that the office is the only acquired property of his own grandfather & that the appellant is not entitled to the office. —

The Sub Dr Offr also tried the issue found the adoption to be proved, but as Resp failed to prove that the office was the only acquired property of his grandfather, decreed

the facts of the case
But the Dy Commissioner
the Decree that in
the Recds of 1847 & 1864,
Respt was declared
entitled as the Brother,
while the appts father
was shewn only as
officiating for him.

The appeal is
against the Decree.

Although the Regr
of 1864 shows that appts father
Devappa was doing
duty for the Respt, the
Regrs of 1847 & 1862 clearly
shew that appt was
a Hissadar or sharer &
held the office on his own
right. The dismissal
of the suit on the ground
that appt did not hold
the office on his own
right is incorrect, &
will be set aside.

No Case was let

appellate

remanded to the Lower Court

for disposal on the other

merits of the case which have

not been gone into.

27/6/92

Appt informed that

the case has been

remanded to the Lower

Appellate Court for further enquiry

& decision.

47

M No 179 of 1892-93

Apte

Narayandas
of Nilavagal Borkar
Manoharam
dead
Mysore

dead
Varanashee

Apte brought a suit for the recovery of Shanbhogi right in the Villages of Kodekalli & Nilavagal, & the D[efendan]t Cont disconnected it as barred by the Law of Limitation. The appeal is against the Decree.

In 1864, Suratta, the brother of the Respt Devappa, the adoptive father of the appt, & other shareers requested that the Shanbhogi right might be registered as follows.—

1 Kodekalli — in the name of Desatta
2 Nilavagal — in the name of Devea adoptive father of appt.—
3 Hoskere — in the name of Suratta Respt's father.

4 1 Kodekalli
5 Hoskere Malkalli 2 Hanumanahalli } in the name of Pullea
3 Mudgeri } 1/2 shares

observed

On the 11th Dy Supt left in [illegible]

~~none could tell~~ how many persons could

well be registered as Barrowers at any, that

the registry should be as before, but Respts

Sarapha

~~father~~ brother having asked the registry when a block

in her name should be transferred to

~~that of~~ the name of the Respt & the claims

her mother the office should be held by

Apl 1876 adoptive father. The registry

was accordingly made.

Leila, adptd Apl 1876 father was ~~accepted~~ observed

during duties ~~rendered since 1881~~. ~~Her~~

son, the natural brother of the Apl, died during

for some time ~~with~~ with the consent of the Respts

Cut in 1886, the Dy Com ordered that the duties

should be performed by the Respt.

Although the suit in Oct 1888.

The Dy Com considered that Apl 1876 father's

right have been acquired in 1884 by the Supt

& he having failed to exercise his rights ~~as~~

Apl 1876 decision barred

Mr Dr Carr thought that
the causes of delay arose in
1884, when Mr Supt refused
to recognise appts of fallen
as Baravandar - But the Govt
observed that Mr Supt did
not say that appts of fallen were
not à Hackdar, & that though
the Baravand was not made
in his name, appts of fallen
he continued to do duties of
Mr village under him till
about 1888 when he died - In his
despatch dated 15th April
1884, Resident admitted that
Dewa did duties till his
death, though with his permission,
& he did not deny that
Dewa was a Hissedar
under other circumstances

Just consider that the cause of action cause of the dead to have arisen on the death of Dora who died in about 1880 & the deed which which was bought in 1888 was when the same allowed by law. The Dep Court will accordingly be requested to take back the Case on her file & dispose of it on its merits.—

Weight ought to attach where was established in a Court Case yet an absent to which the deceased was not a party. There is nothing to prevent the Dep Court giving such question again of respondence the adoption.—

3/1/94

4/3/94

Let the Dep Court be requested to take back the case on its merits

4/3/94

Let when the
appeals are
decided in Civil
Portion thereof
Cross objs
expunged then
MMB
12.3.98

Mrs Hashim
accepts
remission
of Rs 2 only
MMB

5.3.98

1) Ok
2) The Clerk in charge
was absent
14.3.98
14/3/98

Pet^rs Nos 2121 + 2122

1) In time
2) Stamps affixed
3) Second appeal against the
Dy Comm^rs decree recognising
the right of the Respondent to the
Shanbogs Stide of Malavalli
Village Mandya Taluk
4) Council Case

= The Sub R^r office's Certificate
has not been produced, pet^r
stating that the Dy Comm^r refused
to return it. As the Registrar
Dy Comm^r has actually signed
the Statement it is believable
Except the authority for such
a course is not clear

= The matter in appeal has
a history commencing in 1887
& there have been two
remands by the Dy Comm^r
for "disposal on the merits"
The present appeal is against
the decision on the second
remand. Pet^r's Counsel prays for Stay
pending execution of the decree
Mr Lakshmana was a separate charge
Advocate for Respondent

RE 7/3/98
3/3/98

14/3/98

23

Before the Government of Mysore.

Appeal No. 60 of 1897-98

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Narayya of Hosûre, Maudya Taluk		Ranjundaiya Hosûre, Maudya Tk

Subject:— Dispute regarding the right to the Shanbhogi office of Nêlavagal village, Maudya Taluk.

Appeal No. 75 of 1897-98.

Appellant	Respondent
Ranjundaiya	Narayya

Subject:— Claim to the Shanbhogi office of Nêlavagal and Kuliballi villages in the Maudya Taluk.

13 6 98

13.6.98

Posted to 1-3-94 for hearing
Notice to be issued to
hearing

Appellant — Sayindeah
(Plaintiff)

vs

Respondent — Narayappa
(Deft)

This is an appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, setting aside the Appellant's claim to the Inamdari of Chikkanayakanahalli village in the Maadya Taluk.

Appellant, Sayindeah, filed a Suit in the Munsif Court as Sub-Division officer's Court as follows:—

1. That Plaintiff is the adopted Son of Ogariah
2. That the Plaintiff and the 1st Defendant are cousins i.e. Sons of the two brothers

2 Defendant and the

Plaintiff are "Traders" as stated

aforesaid

4 That the 3rd Defendant was a

relative of the Plaintiff

5 [illegible] at the time of [illegible] Plaintiff [illegible]

the wages were [illegible] 1st Defendant. [illegible]

[illegible] as shown in the Bought [illegible] Defts

6. That the Plaintiff [illegible] Defts [illegible]

1. [illegible] Robertsville Centre

[illegible] the duties of the [illegible]

the wages of the share [illegible]

7 That the 1st Defendant has wrongfully

refused to render and has still

[illegible] of the accounts.

8 That the cause of action arose

within six years

The Plaintiff therefore claims

against the Defendants jointly and

severally

1 [illegible]
2 Kwikasa

1 [illegible]
2 [illegible]

1 [illegible]
2 [illegible]
3 [illegible]

Genealogical tree of Rajaniah

" My adoptive father Rajaniah was looking after the Zamindari of both Nelamangala and Kodihalli during his life time, and after his death my elder brother was discharging the duties. On the complaint of the 1st defendant, that he was the eldest son of the deceased Rajaniah there was no practice of writing adoption-deeds then. There is no written authority with me to prove it. After his death, I have not obtained any pendigreed declaring that I am his adopted son. It is decided by the Munsiff of Srirangapatam that I am his adopted son and heir. The Zamindari of the two villages has been in the enjoyment of my ancestors from the time of Rajaniah

dhanam" Even if it were

ed as "Sri Shanmuni" Since

spoke of grand father Sarappa

my grand father, Sangamaid

the sons of Kapanah. I am

entitled to adore in it, as

performing the functions of

Samadhi of the two villages

question not as gurusta but

as head of Dharmada. If

were acting after the offic

as the Dharmada

would not have performed my brother

Venkatesh from the office. My

brother was doing the duties of

The 1st Defendant's position

was as follows:

"The Plaintiff is not the hereditary

[illegible] Samadhigars of the two villages

vacate the office for him. The
Sanabogi of these two villages, Horakeri
Kottureshetti and Mallabalii is in
my name. I am looking after
the duties of the Sanabogi of Horakeri
Kodiabelli and Nirvagal and
Adarapa of the remaining two villages.
I owe no share to Plaintiff, Ramiah
Dyavaiah executed a will in favour
of his daughter, when he was alive.
If the Plaintiff had really been
adopted by him, he would have
mentioned the same in his will.
Though Dyavaiah is the adopted son of
Ayyundiah, he has no claim for the
Sanabogi. The Sanabogi was
received as Swidhanam by my
father's adoptive father from
Sitaramiah about 60 years ago.
There is no deed of gift for proving
to prove this. I heard that there was
the case. Thus when Dyaviah
himself had no claim for the office
it is not useful to give the

Sanabagi to the Plaintiff who is
not the adopted son of Dyaneish.
He has not obtained any certificate
to show that he is the adopted son of
Dyaneish. During the life time of
Dyaneish, he was looking after the
duties of the Sanabagi of the villages
so gumasta and not as heredary, on
account of my minority. After
Dyaneish's death, Plaintiff also
[illegible] Bhaskarrao officiated as
Sanabagi for 4 or 6 years, When
I was given the account of the
two villages in dispute, according
to orders of the Darkast no — Subvid IV.
888. If Plaintiff were the
adopted son, why should he not-
raised objection and retained
the office then only"

The Defendants' statement was as
follows: —

"It is true that the Sanabagi
Watandari and the Inam land were

I know nothing about the statement of the 1st Defendant that it was received as "Siddhanam". It is true that Plaintiff is the adopted son of Dyaviah. The Plaintiff performed the obsequies of Dyaviah. Dyaviah did the duties of the Canabogue or headar like myself. After the receipt of the order stating that Narrappa was the "Baramadar" and that he should himself perform the duty, the 1st Defendant, Narrappa does the duties. The villages were not in my possession. I have no objection if Narrappa were to give the villages to the Plaintiff.

The Plaintiff examined five witnesses - P.W.1 to three witnesses stated that Dyaviah did the duties of the office of Canabogue or headar and not as gumasta.

The following issues were framed on the case

1 [illegible] Plaintiff is the adopted
son of Dyaniah

2 [illegible] Dyaniah [illegible] after
the death of the Samadgi of the
village, he [illegible] Dhondai

3 [illegible] the Plaintiff's father
obtained the Samadgi of the village
and whether there was any written
authority in support of it.

4 Whether the Suit [illegible] Dhondai, whether the
Plaintiff or the 1st Defendant is
the office in his place

5 Whether the Suit barred by the law of
limitation. -

(No Letter has been sent from
[illegible] Court Peshwa Records).

The Plaintiff filed the [illegible]
suit

Judgment on 25th [illegible] 1889
in the file of the Subordinate Judge
Thana [illegible]

3

Ex. 9.- Copy of the deposition given by the 1st Defendant before the Deputy Collector of Madura, in which he admits that Dyavaiah is Kiravadar and was doing duty in the said villages.

in p showing that Dyavaiah is a "Kiravadar" (order of the Adda)

The 1st Defl. produces the following Exhs

Ex. II. Order from the Deputy Superintendent of the year 1864 — ordering that the deceased Sivappa's name, shall be registered as Samabagee and that till he is trained to the work, the profits shall be taken from Dyavaiah.

Ex III Deposition of Brahmans before the Deputy Collector stating that the 1st Defendant was the "Karnavadar" and that he was only a "Kiravadar" and that he officiated for some years with the consent

9. 7. 90

34

The Deputy Commissioner reversed the decree of the Sub Division officer for the following reasons: -

From 1847 downwards, Ramnagar, a place of Ramnagar, is entered as "Haldar" and Bysnab as "officiating" in the Register

If Bysnab was the Haldar and Ramnarain a Malagar, he would have been entered as Haldar in the Ramnad Register of 1863, when his name is altogether omitted. In the Register of 1866 Ramnarain is entered as Haldar and Bysnab officiating for Ramnarain, during the latter's minority

24-10-13

Against this order, Bysnab appealed to the Government, who set aside the order of the Deputy Commissioner and remanded the case to the Court for disposal on the merits of the case. -

The Deputy Commissioner



No 2595

Ref. 38/87

K. Seshadriyer Esquire C.E.

Chief Engineer P.C. Mysore.

The humble Petition of Bhaskara
residing at Yerriraji Shantapur
Neimgala Hobli &c Villages of Bunny
Taluk. Mundgaru Taluk.

Most respectfully Sheweth.

The Petitioner most respectfully begs to prefer the complaint in the following matter against the order dated the 20th February 1886 passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer French Rocks.

There are 8 Villages attached to the Bunny Taluq are devided into 2 Divisions called by 2 - Revenue Inspectors viz - Narrapur & Pollard and under the 1st Revenue Inspector there are 2 Hyderabad Shareholders viz Expectants & Deposed.

the

accounts &c. against Land Com-
plaints &c. &c. &c. to that effect.

While in the year 1842 the
Barrister's Chamber was being
a certain Judge existing between
him & the petitioner with intent to
deprive the petitioner from the
Shanbogue's Office Entitled to report
addressed to the Sub-Division Office to the
Deputy Surveyor of Mercara with
a petition alleged to have been
drawn in the name of the Villagers
to the effect that the petitioners
has been in the habit of collecting
Contingencies in excess of the allot-
ments &c.

The Sub-Division Office
directed the Deputy Surveyor
to submit a report in the matter.

He suspects the Deputy Surveyor

time when both the Justices concerned were ordered to be in attendance.

During the Examinations when both the Justices were present the Deputy Auditors after making enquiries intimated the Sub-Divisional Officers that in the Talukas there are numberless Shareholders to the Mills & the Solicitors who discharge the duties independently of the Registers

Upon this the Sub-Divisional Officers ordered that a Statement of such individuals should be prepared & submitted to enable him (Officers) to solicit for the hours the Servants Conscience as per his (Revenue) Proceedings to issue separate Summons (Orders) to each such persons who are

such

Varnafsah Refused that the Agreement were handed him to him 3 years ago only in fun that the Sub. divisional Officer Mr Tomlinson ordered the petitioner to produce documents & Agreements showing that the petitioner & his parties have been cultivating the Thumbapeeu. Varnafsah was ordered to show that the petitioner & his parties were evicted from Thumbapeeu upto 3 years ago.

The Sub. Divisional Officer having arrived at the above 2 conclusions had an Order to the Mudaliar Arulan directing the parties to produce themselves before the Arulan & from their allegations The said Order was verbally communicated to the parties.

While the petitioner was proceeding with his documents & witnesses

45

Cancelled Office Copy. Executed by Petitioners
Copies of Grant & the Petitioners Marks
respectfully prays that upon hearing
what he shall advance for the grounds
& reasons herein set forth in the Petition.

The Vermont Land Patent Register
of 1847 & 1862 (Certified Copies
herein enclosed) clearly establishes
the Petitioners title right & claim
that his Father was Commanded to Locate
& Survey his right as such (Vide Colonial
Act 394 & the said Statute).

The Petitioner begs leave
respectfully
Submitted

Counsel for Petitioner

Attorney for Petitioner

(2)

No. 664

Mysore Dewan's Office,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

Official Memorandum.

R. B. 87

Sl 2

The accompanying Petition No. 1702, dated 2nd December 1887 received at the Dewan's Office from Nanjaraj Urs Varu & Srinivasa Rao Varu & other Villagers of Kemmanahalli Hunasa Kasi

is forwarded, together with its five enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner Hassan District for Enquiry & Report.

Draft

BANGALORE,

5 January 1888.

By Order,

Secretary.

From Thuluvanadu 7-9-87 — 5-1-88

Mysore Government Press, Bangalore.—5-10-86.—2000.

COURT FEE

TEN RUPEES

COURT FEE

TEN RUPEES

3477

[redacted]

ਹੁੰਦਾ ਹੈ- ਜਦੋਂ ਕੋਈ ਵਸਤ ਦੀ ਕੁਝ ਹੋਰ ਵਸਤੂਆਂ ਨਾਲ ਤੁਲਨਾ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ

ਤਾਂ ਉਸ ਦੀ ਕੀਮਤ ਦਾ ਪਤਾ ਲੱਗਦਾ ਹੈ- ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੀ ਕਿਸੇ ਵਿਅਕਤੀ ਦੀ ਕੀਮਤ ਦਾ ਪਤਾ ਵੀ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਕੰਮਾਂ ਦੀ ਤੁਲਨਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਹੀ ਲਗਾਇਆ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ- ਇਸ ਲਈ ਕਿਸੇ ਵਿਅਕਤੀ ਦੀ ਕੀਮਤ ਦਾ ਪਤਾ ਲਗਾਉਣ ਲਈ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਕੰਮਾਂ ਦੀ ਤੁਲਨਾ ਕਰਨੀ ਪੈਂਦੀ ਹੈ- ਇਸ ਤੁਲਨਾ ਵਿਚ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਕੰਮਾਂ ਦੀ ਤੁਲਨਾ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਵਿਅਕਤੀ ਦੇ ਕੰਮਾਂ ਨਾਲ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾ

(General Serial No. 21.)

1887

From

Asst Commissioner
Mysore District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

L.R. 36 of 87

Dated 7th May 1887 Sl 4

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file

General No. 79 | 188 .

No official memo no 6 dated 5th January last, calling for submission of proceedings in re petition of Shanbhog Bhaskara, of Mandya Taluk.

Has the honor to submit herewith the Proceedings as called for in the above.

J. Wilkinson
Asst Commissioner
Mysore Dist

Compd
Mr Smith

17-5-88

L.R. 369/87

(3)

(5)

21/11/88

(5)

SSL 2.36 X 87
SL 6

(General Serial No. 34.)

No. 2895

ENDORSEMENT.

In reply to his Petition, dated 29 December 1887

Bharathiraja of Vijayapuri, Sringeri

Taluk

is informed that

the order appealed against is

confirmed. The Registered

Paramadas will perform the

duties. Enclosures are returned.

By Order,

(Sd.) C. Rangacharlu,

Chief Secretary.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
May 1888.

25/30

Mysore Government Press, Bangalore.—7-9-85.—2,000.

P. V. C.





No. 2719

Petition to file

Petition of the Dewan of Mysore Bangalore.

2nd appeal No: 8 of 1891

Appellant & Respondent

Ramjeendiah - Ramappa.

The appellant above named appeal to this Honorable court against the judgment of the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore in Appeal Suit No: 1 of 1890-91 for the following among other reasons:-

I. The Lower court was wrong in admitting additional evidence offered by the Respondent.

II. The Lower court has either ignored or misunderstood the evidence oral and documentary, adduced by the appellant and gives no good reasons for upsetting the original decree.

III. Some of the records filed by the Respondent also support the appellant's case.

IV. The Lower court erred in holding that Deria was officiating for Ramappa in respect of suit villages in the face of Exhibit Q which clearly shows that Deriah was a Shikadar and was holding the office in suit in his own right.

V

V. The Lower court has lost sight of the important Exhibits 'I' and 'N' which clearly prove that Plaintiff's father Devaiah held the office in suit Co for back as 1831-32 while inachendari -ty of Pl. Defendants stock.

VI. The Lower court was wrong in subscribing that the order of 1864 included the suit villages also. It only related to the 2 villages of Kalasuttu and Maradinganahilly which were held by Pl. Defendant as a minor on the death of his brother.

VII. The so called admission of Devaiah in Exhibit No: III does not bear the construction put on it by the Lower court. Further it is not binding on the appellant.

VIII. The judgment of the Lower court is opposed to Law and evidence.

IX. For the foregoing reasons and others that may be urged on the date of hearing the appellant humbly prays that the decision of the Lower court may be reversed and the decision of the court of first instance restored with costs for the appellant throughout.

Bangalore.
5th Feb 1913

Advocate for the appellant

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. [illegible]

dated [illegible] received at the

Dewan's Office from [illegible]

[illegible]

is forwarded, together with its [illegible]

enclosures, to the [illegible]

[illegible]

By Order,

BANGALORE,
[illegible] 1897.

Chief Secretary

Noted

(General Serial No. 30.)

OFFICE OF THE 9987 18 JAN. 92 DEWAN OF MYSORE

1892

From

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE MYSORE DISTRICT

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated 17th December 1891 at Bangalore

Despatched 4th January

Received 5

Enclosures No. 2 files

General No. 8824

No.

His official Memo No. 81 dated 7th June 1891, forwarding for submission proceedings, petition of Anjaneedinlu Hanumappa Mandyam Taluq.

Has the honour to submit herewith the proceedings called for in the above letter, together with an English precis thereof, received with Assistant Deputy Commissioner's letter No. 755, dated 5th instant.

The petition received with the Memo under reply is also herein enclosed.

I have &c.

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Shan Ghosi Case

Further notes put up

Submitted to the Council.

L.R. 36987
Sl 9

Sl
21/1/92

Mr. A. G.
Sir will be
glad to
Sl
21/1

Mr. 5th May 1892
Sl
22/1/92

Mr. le
22/1/92

AG
18-1-92

Compd.

58

P/2

Précis.

Petitioner Ranjendiah sued 1. Rairappa, 2. Devappa and 3. Putta Hennaiah for the Shanbogue Office of the villages of Nilnagil and Kodihalli in Mandya Taluk.

The Barawand of these two villages stands in the name of Rairappa, 1st defendant, who is now the Shanbogue.

Petitioner Ranjendiah asserted that he and the three defendants were the descendants of the same "Mul Purusha", but divided in interest. That when partition was effected between the several members of the family, the Shanbogue Rights of the two villages in question fell to the share of Dasaiah, his adoptive father. That Dasaiah continuously conducted the duties as a Hereditary till his death. That afterwards petitioner's

Ramabadra Nayakan [illegible]
disclose that Govinda was the
Kuchbar, but the case showed
that he was only a gumastah
for the minor Ramappa.

Petitioner Ranjundiah
now appeals against the decree
of the Deputy Commissioner.

Barnewall
Lab Division Appeal
French Rocks

(General Serial No. 30.)

62

1892

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

L.R. 36 of 87 The Dy. Comm.r
Kigaon Distt.

Sl. 10 *Dated* 7th }
Despatched 12 } July 1892
Received

Enclosures No. one file of V. papers

General No. 365
Pol. F. No. 25—92-93

Remanding to the Lower Appellate Court for disposal, the case of Nanjundiah, adopted son of Deviah, Shankere village, on Brantya Lakshi, claiming the office of Shanbhogi in the village of Chavagal Hobli, Kadur Taluk.

References to be marked.

New draft for Approval

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

(10)

(C)

Appeal No. 919 of 1891

L.R. 369/87
SL 10

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Nanjundayya, adopted son of Devaiah, residing at Bookere, Mandya Taluk. — Narayya, residing at Bookere

Decision. 25.6.92.

Appellant brought a suit for the recovery of his office of Shanbogi in the villages of Hangal and Kodihalli. These villages were held by Bhaskaria, the natural mother of the Appellant, up to 1870, when the Sub Division Officer issued an order that as Respt was the Grandson, he should do duties, and that if Bhaskaria was entitled to the office, he might bring a suit. This order was confirmed by the Dewan.

The Respt admits that the appellant's alleged adoptive father was his

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 65 of

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Decision.

held the opinion on his own right. The dismissal of the petition to the ground that appellant did not hold the office on his own right is incorrect and will be set aside, and the case will be remanded to the lower Appellate Court for disposal on the merits of the case which have not been gone into.

By order

Chief Secy.

6/7/92

No 565.

Pet. 5-20—22-6.

Copies to the Commr. Mysore etc., in the Judl. Dept. Receipts Nos 584 & 7/92

Chief Secy

No. [illegible]

Subject.

Nanjundappa appointed on
probation, vice [illegible]
Manjappa [illegible]

Endorsement.

L.R. 36 D. 87

In reply to his Petition dated 5th Feb. 1891 applicant is informed that the case has been remanded to the Lower Appellate Court for further enquiry and decision.

2. The enclosures are herewith returned.

1/7/92

Mysore Dewan's Office,
Petition Department,
[illegible] 1892.

By Order,

Asst. Secretary.

Mysore Government Central Press Bangalore.—28-9-91—1000.

Issued with enclosures
12-7-92

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893.

No. 2573

Name of Petitioner. Nanjundiah
son of Subbajatlu

Village. Hoskere

Taluk. Nanjanagud

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi. 12-4-93

Date of Receipt. 12-4-93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. two.

ABSTRACT.

Appeal against the judgement
passed by the Deputy Commissr
of Mysore in Revenue regular
Referred case No. 3 of 1892-93 re
his claim to the Shanbogueship
of the two villages of Nelavanga
& Kodihully.

12/4

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-2-92,—1000.

27-4-93

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
RECD. NO. 2998
DATE 12-12-93.

MYSORE COURT FEE

12

Presented by
Mysore Subramanya
on behalf of
Mr Subbapattiah
Dixit
12th Dec 93.

H. S. No 179
92-93.

Before the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja Raja of Mysore.

Decree appealed of 1893.

Nanjundia (Plaintiff) Appellant.

H.

Nanappa (Defendant) Respondent.

The Appellant begs to submit this
Appeal to the Government against the
Judgment passed by the Deputy Commr
of Mysore in Regular Original Suit
Case No 3 of 1892 for the following reasons

1. The Deputy Commissioner
has erred in holding that the
Plaintiff's suit is barred by
the Law of Limitation.

2. The Deputy Commissioner
has not correctly construed
the effect of Exhibit No II in
order of the
Deputy

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
16 DEC 93

Grounds of Appeal continued.

Deputy Superintendent issued
in 1864. This Finding really entitles
the Plaintiffs claim.

3. The Deputy Commissioner has erred
in imagining to the effect that he
had no jurisdiction after the Stamping

4. Plaintiff has amply established
his Claim in the Office of the Re-
Villages of Nellanguda Kodikal

5. The Deputy Commissioner has
erred in his observations regard-
ing the question of adoption

Subscribed the Appeal.
Barr. at Law

Bangalore 3. Advocate for
12th April 1873 Appellant.

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Dy Commr
Mysore District

Draft for approval

Dated

Despatched 2.R.1898

Received

Enclosures No. 1 to 3

General No. 1720
Pet No. 1297

for forwarding the copy of a certain Judgment pronounced by Pt Ranjavadia, for the memorandum thereunto containing the date on which the copy was applied for and prepared, being certified to by a responsible Officer

References to be marked.

From the same Lr. 315 dy 29-4-93.

Mysore Govt. C. Press, Bangalore.—9-1-93.—3,000.

The Registry Commissioner
Mysore District

In forwarding herewith ~~the~~ a copy of the Judgment in Revenue Regular Referred Case No 5 of 1892-93, instituted by Ramjan Saib "Plaintiff" with his petition of Appeal ~~against the said judgment~~ for reversal of the Judgment, I have the honour to ~~request that the~~ observe that the ~~decision of the Court will be found~~ contained in the Memorandum of the Grounds, the date on which the copy was applied for and prepared, is certified by a responsible officer and return the copy as early as practicable.

No 17210.
Ref: 1297

I am also directed to say that the Registrar of Lands is temporarily with, and to request that the Registrar will do so and to cause a corrected memorandum duly certified to be appended to the copy

By Order
Mysore
17/4
for Chief Secretary.

Draft

(General Serial No. 30.)

12878

1893 - 793

Per 513

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 25th April 1893.

Despatched L.R. 369 87

Received Sl 14

Enclosures No. Letter

General No.

No. 1313

Returning the copy of Judgment in Revenue regular referred case No. 3 of 1892-93 together with a memorandum certified as required.

Peter Br
Mysore 30/4

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—27-1-93.—5,000.

No. 1313.
On file.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT.

Dated Mysore 27th April 1893.

From

A. Rangaswamy Iyengar Esqre

Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore,

SIR,

In forwarding herewith the copy of Judgment passed with your Petition No. 1297 for Letters with a memorandum certified as required, I have the honor to state that the dates are correct as per entries in the office Register and on the application.

The copy etc and the delivery Munshi have been warned to be careful in future.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

A Rangaswamy Iyengar
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Compd.
ully.

Pet 1
1432

D. 20.602 Nov 92

13/5/93

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM. 16

LR. 36987
Sel 16

The accompanying Petition No. 2593
dated 12-4-93 received at the
Dewan's Office from Nanjundaya
of Hosakere Hanaya Taluk, appealing
against the judgment passed by
the Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore, in
Revenue Regular Appeal Case No 15
of 1892, regarding the Inamdaya
Hanaya of Kadabagere
is forwarded, together with its one
enclosure, to the Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District, for submission
of proceedings with a report on
the facts of the case and on the
points taken in the petition

2. The petition, with its enclosure,
should be returned

By Order,

Draft
SV

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
May 1893.

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—21-11-92—3,000.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893.

1989.

14 JUL 93

892

17

From The Deputy Commissioner
Inglore Division

To The Chief Secretary
to the Govt

Dated 11th August 93 Inglore

Despatched

Received

L.R. 3687
S1 17

Enclosures No. 2.

General No. 1471
No.

Submitting proceedings
in connection with
Ranjundaiah, Police
Peon of Kanive Circle
& Kodihalli

P.R.A.
Mark
14/8

No. 117

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore 16th August 1893.

From

K. Madhava Rao Esquire,
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore,

SIR,

With reference to your special memo No. 1132 dated 12th instant, forwarding for submission proceedings, petition from Ranjundiah, & Kotare, Kunda Gowda Regarding the Thandaji of Hilagar, and Kodiala Village, I have the honor to submit herewith the proceedings called for in the above letter with the petition received with the memo under reply.

The English Judgments in the case, will clearly explain the circumstances of the case

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

K. Madhava Rao

Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

Encld.
Tely.

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

77

16

Appeal No. 179 of 1892-93.

L.R. 36 of 87

Sl 19.

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Sanjivadas Dwarkadas, Hindu Inhabitant of Mysore (by Mr. Narasipatigya, Barrister-at-Law).

Lingappa (represented by Mr. C. Sathara Char, Vakeel).

Decision. 4th March 1894

Appellant brought a suit for the recovery of Shanbhogi right in the villages of Doddaballa and Nirnagal, and the Deputy Commissioner dismissed it as barred by the law of limitation. The appeal is against the decree.

2. In 1864, Lingappa, the brother of the Respondent, Devappa, the adoptive father of the Appellant, and other shareholders requested that the Shanbhogi right might be registered

1 Kottakalle — in the name of Dasappa

2 Subbaya — in the name of Devva adoptive father of Appellant

3 Hokkera — in the name of Surappa Respondents brother

4 ... Kodikalle
21 Hanbingamalle
3) Kudigere
4) Kottigalla
5) Kallalli
} in the name of Putta 1/2 share

On this the Deputy Superintendent observed that too many persons could not be recognized to command data, that the inquiry should be as before, that Respondents brother, Surappa having died, the enquiry which stood in his name should be transferred to the name of the Respondent and that during his minority the office should be held by Appellant adoptive father the inquiry was accordingly

made.

3 The Deputy Commissioner thought that the cause of action arose in 1864, when the Deputy Superintendent refused to recognize Appellant's father as Baramadan. But the Government observe that the Deputy Superintendent did not say that appellant's father was not a Hackdar, and that though the Baramadan was not made in his name, he continued to do duties in the village under notice till about 1880 when he died. In his deposition dated 15th April 1884, Respondent admitted that Devia did duties till his death, though not his permission, and he did not deny that Devia was a Hackdar.

4 Under these circumstances Government consider that the cause of action could only be said to have arisen on the death

of

of Decree, and dec in favour of
and the suit which was brought
in 1886 was within the time allowed
by Law. The Deputy Commissioner
will accordingly be requested to
take back the case on the file and
dispose of it on its merits

Though Respondent's claim
was sometime ago established in a
Civil Case yet as the Respondent
was not a party to that suit, the
decree is not conclusive and binding
on him and there is nothing to
prevent the Deputy Commissioner
going into the question afresh if
Respondent desires the adoption

adopt
15-7-94
R 220-92

by order
KM 17/3/94
Assistant

Copy communicated to the Deputy Commissioner
Cuttack with the proceedings
received vide his No. 1478 dt the
August 1893

by order

Assistant Secretary

No. 2593
A. No. 179

L.R. 369-87 E1
SL MP

20-3-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
15 March 1894
20

(19)

Endorsement granted to Chairman of Sirsi, Kanara Dist.
(by the Ritharajaya Sanskrit Co)

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 2593 dated 12th March 1894
A. No. 179
appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Kanara Dist.
regarding the Ritharajaya Sanskrit Co.

Petitioner is informed that the Deputy Commissioner, Kanara District
has been requested to forward the case
with his remarks

The enclosures is returned

MM
9/3/1894

MM
15/3

"By Order"

Ar Bargi
Mee
6/3.

MM 17/3/94
for Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000.

The Appellant - Karanappa stated that the Dy - Comr refused to return the copy of the Subdivision Officer's judgment + decn.

2d I. R. 4.

18/2/98

Sited with pet[n] No 2122.

(1) The appeal is on 10R stamp

(2) The order appealed against is dy 15-1-98.

(3) Petr prays for order to stay Execution (vide petn no 2122)

MLJ

21.2.98

The Dy Comr refers to the judgment & decree in Appeal No. 27 of 1891 dismissed on 27/6/92 as a stage in the history of this case

= Submits up

MLJ 23/2/98

To, Ver Records for compliance.

MLJ

25/2/98

1-3-98

Copies sent to Pet & Res 1/3/98

Collector Office Peon sent 1/3/98

Subd - (Vide Serial No 19)

1/3/98 MLJ

6.

2C

1898

No. 2121 R.S. No. 60 97-98.

Name of Petitioner Karanappa

Village Hosakere

Taluk Mandya

District Mysore

Date of Arzi 17-2-98

Date of Receipt 22-2-98

Date of Disposal I.R. 3-6-98.

No. of Enclosure 2 Sl. Dy

Petr - Karanappa - Appellant
Ranjandish - Respondent.

ABSTRACT

This is an appeal against the decision of 15-1-98 of the Dy. Comr of the Mysore district in Revenue Appeal No 11 of 1896-97, ~~confirming~~ confirming the order of the Subdivision Officer that Ranjandish was entitled to the Shanbhoga of the Nelavagal village.

The grounds of appeal are the following -

1 That the allegation
of the respondent is illegal
& false and that he is
not entitled to the
Shambhagi of Nilavagile.

2 That the suit is
barred & the respondent
estopped from claiming
the office

3 That the respondent's
father Daniel had no
independant right to
the office & that he was
only a servant of
the appellant.

4 That the appellant is
the hereditary Shanbhogue
& that the lower Courts
have not properly
appreciated the evidence

5 That the decisions
of the lower Courts are
opposed to probabilities
of the case.

~~That~~ on these grounds the
appellant prays that
the orders of the lower
Courts may be set aside
& plaintiff's suit decreed with
Costs throughout.

~~Exhibits~~ Enclosed the

of the judgment of
15-1-98 of the Dy.
Comrs.

Enclosure-2. The copy
of the decree stating that
Rs 97-15-10 was to
be paid to Ranganatha
by Narasappa.

MG.
18/2/98

Before the Court of
the Duncan in
Council Mysore

R.C.A. No. 60 of 1928

Narasappa

vs

Munidasa

86

Before the Court of the Deemen in
Council Mysore

Remme appeal No. 60 of 97-8.

Nanaraja residing in Hosakoti village Mandya Taluk ... Applicant

vs

Nanjundaiya residing in Hosakoti village Mandya Taluk ... Respondent

Plaintiff

Appeal against the decision of the Deputy Commissioner Mysore passed in Remme appl. No. 806-7 dated 5th day of January 1898 for the following and among other reasons hereby:—

1 That the alleged adoption of the Respondent (Plaintiff) is illegal and false and that he is not entitled to the Shanbogue of Nilamigal;

2 That the suit is barred and the Respondent estopped from

claiming the office.

3. That the respondents father Daniel had no independent right to the office and that he was only a [illegible] of the electors.

4. That the appellant is the lawful claimant, and that the lower Courts have not jurisdiction over the subject.

5. That the decisions of the lower Courts is opposed to probable justice in the case.

For these reasons the petitioner prays that this honorable Court may be pleased to set aside the decisions of the lower Courts and plaintiff have decreed to him costs of suit.

Vide petn no 2121
21.2.98.

87
1898

No. 2122

Name of Petitioner Siddappa Naranappa

Village Hosken Hicka

Taluk Nanjan

District Mysore

Date of Arzi

Date of Receipt 18-2-98

Date of Disposal L.R. 369-87 & 90

No. of Enclosure nil

ABSTRACT

States that he has appealed to Govt against the D/Commrs order in case No 11 of 96-97:-

Shankarlé Siddappa } vs Ranjmadaya

Prays for a stay of proceedings against the said order of the D/Commrs in favour of the respt, inlieu of his appeal pending with the Govt.

K. 18/2/98

2 Rs Stamps

2122.

Chiranjilal
18-2-98

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. No 2122R
DATE 18-2-98

Pet 1139 F 2

14-3-98

(2)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition

Registered No. 2121 dated 17-2-98

received at the Dewan's Office from

Narasappa of Hosakere village, Kasaba Hobli appealing against the order of Lower Mysore Court in Regl. Appeal No 11 of 96-97 confirming the order of the Sub-Court passed regarding the Shanbhoga of Hirisave village

is forwarded, together with its enclosure, to the Deputy Commissioner, of the Mysore District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case.

2. The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

2. The Lower Court is directed to stay the execution of the order appealed against pending disposal of this appeal

By order,

Bangalore, 14/3/1898.

Chief Secretary.

14-3-98

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-95—1,000.

189

91

The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To L.R. 3607/97

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

Dated 19th
Despatched } April 1898
Received

General No. 1215
No.

Enclosure No. Petition No. 212 with 2 Sn. Sale Bills with exhibits and

Submits Entire Proceedings Connected with the petition of Narasappa of Hosa Kere village Nanjangud taluk

Petition No. 1.
23/4/98

Reqd-particulars.
AK
25/4/98

Subd
27.4.98

Posted to 13th June 1898

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated [illegible] 189[illegible]

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

SIR,

11.5.98 Appln

To Ver: Records for perfn.

Sign
12/5/98

[illegible]

X Petn No 2614

Receipt No 11397 dt 14-3-98.

Sign
14/5/98

Ref: Memo sent for Ex. Engr No: 7690 for Mr. Ellyson
Dt: 12/5/98 dt 19-4-98.
(Ex. Engr: Sl: on 23/4/98.)

AK
16/5/98

Write Draft to submit with perfn
18/5/98

Admit the appeal
as under Sec 561 C.P.C
respondent is allowed to
lodge his objection within 1/
he has not filed a cross-appeal

Sd 19/5/98

93

(24) Dr. S.N.
1898

No. 2745 A.S. No. 75 97-98

Name of Petitioner Narasimhia Son of [illegible]

Village Hosakere

Taluk Nandya

District Mysore

Date of Arzi 7-5-98

Date of Receipt 7-5-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

Reference Appeal No. 27/97-98 of 27th June 1898

ABSTRACT

Appeals against the decision of 15-1-98 of the Dy. Comr. Mysore Petnt in Ori: Regular Appeal No. 11 of 1896-97 on his file, dismissing the suit, holding that, [illegible] Court holding that, [illegible] Vakil Venkoji for the Respdts and hearing the appellant's Vakil and dismissing the appeal with all costs.

Memorandum of appeal:-

1. The Court should not have rejected the plaint as barred by limitation in the Civil Court and the decision of the question of the validity of the adoption (sic) the evidence adduced by both the

95

Kifedu: dafaqpa: ituttiku: ka: tuu
illaqo-

Kaq: tuat uuma: tiu: fareforj: iu-
-aaneliaue: a: deuiuu: nadaq: leqiqa
alleriqfiu: deuiuu: qfiu: uuma: tuq-
aaeq: frautiqfiuu: iu: illaqe: q-
Kaaa: kalli: ualla: taat: taat.

Enclosure

(1) Instrument of Surr. Lease dtd.
in Rev. Kepler Appeal Nos. 11, 95 & 96.

KK
10/5/98

L.R. 36987

30-6-98

—u—

By Order

For Secretary

Bldg
2nd/6 F2

No. 12363
P.725-12 & 25.6.98
30

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commr, Mysore District, for information together with the records received with his letter No. 215 dated 9th April 98

By Order

For Secretary

100

2745

L.R.3698

26

By Order

for Secretary

By Order

for Secretary

24/6. No. 12366/P.725-72 dt. 29.6.98.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Dy C^r, Mysore District for information

By Order

for Secretary

Reference

7.10.98

102 1898

No. 724

Name of Petitioner Nanjundiah
Petition of Dyavanna

Village Hiriyur

Taluk Nagamangala

District Mysore

Date of Arzi 20-6-98

Date of Receipt 27-9-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosures Nil

55-1898 No 1286 dt 22-6-98.
R.T. 25-98

R.T. 25/98 Containing the reps relating to the Thirdborgship of Nanjundiah of Hiriyur Village, Nagamangala Taluk

L.R. 36 of 97
S.C. 77

12/10/98
Sent

(1) Petition
(2) Notice (Rupees 8) Sent Receipt
(3) Application for Review & Record order dated 27.6.1898 (Encl No 25) declining Inquiry

R.10.98
Sub D 2nd Council
13/10/98

Give no sufficient grounds warranting review of appellate decision

18/10/98
Sub D 1st Council

19/10/98

Issue

Q.11.10.98
Quasi-judicial
Bln
1/11

ABSTRACT

The petr appellant in Rev. A.S. No 2 of 1897-98, states that Nanjappa, respondent in the above suit, never disclaimed the right of petr's father Dyavanna having done the duties of both the villages of Nanjapatta and Kadahalli and has been admitted the same in his deposition on 15-4-1884 before the Deputy Tahsildar at Hiriyur that if this had not been the case, the point would have been made an issue

such being the case
Sub-Dn officer in para 5 of
his judgment, states that
the petr did not prove the
point; that it was not
right to have found fault
with the petr while he was
entirely ignorant of the
point having been made
an issue; that is accordingly
represented in his petn to
the Dy Comm: and the Govt:
the injustice done to him in having
included this as a point at issue;
that he was not favoured
with a reply; that a perusal
of the Barandah accounts,
Cattivaram & Census registers, that
and Kiirdi and also the respondents'
deposition will clearly show that the
petr's father was doing the duties of
both the villages for the last 40 years;
that the Sheikdar, Patel and Shanbogue
of the neighbouring village have deposed
in favour of the petr; that in the
face of such evidence, the Govt
have decided that petr's father
was not doing the duties of both the villages

Prays that the records may
be once more perused and that
the Govt: order may be reviewed,
and that the Barandah of Kodakallu
may be made in his name and that
in case it cannot be done, the perusal records such
as points, whereby one of the two villages may be
erased and a fair table order passed.

6/10/96. Prays that this Office Notice No 2745 issued from
[illegible] month back.

Five Rupees stamp affixed only

Registered
No. ——
Date ——

Registered
No. ——
Date ——

Registered
No. ——
Date ——

[redacted]

ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳು ಸಹ ಕಾಣಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ
ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿಕೆ.

ಸ್ಥಳಗಳ ಮಾರ್ಗಗಳ ವಿವರ ದಾಖಲಿಸಿ
ಮಾರ್ಗಸೂಚಿಯನ್ನು ಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸಿ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು
ಅಳವಡಿಸಿ ಮುದ್ರಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲು ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೋರಿ
ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ
ಅಗತ್ಯವಾದ ಸಹಾಯ ಸಹಕಾರ ನೀಡಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ
ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಆದೇಶ ನೀಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿಕೆ.

ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯ
ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಸಿದ್ಧವಿದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯವಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ
ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗುವುದು

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಿನಾಂಕ 3/11/98

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

ವಿಷಯ

ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ

L.R.36 & 87

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ

ಪ್ರತಿ

By Order

Section Officer

Draft

Typed

4/11